

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 have been examined. Claim 15 has been added. Claims 1-15 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claim rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 10-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Colgan (USPN 6,377,233). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

For example, claim 1 recites the feature that the light modulation section be “transmissive”. The Examiner contends that the transmissive light modulation section requirement is met by virtue of the deformable mirror 218 of Colgan. However, Colgan only teaches a “reflective display” which uses the deformable mirror 218 (see, e.g., col. 12, lines 40-45). The deformable mirror may be in one of two positions -- a relaxed position or a collapsed position. The deformable mirror is deformed, allowing black dye into a gap, and this dye in the gap changes the intensity of the reflected light. (see col. 8, lines 15-65). Colgan thus teaches a reflective light modulator, not a transmissive light modulator, as required by claim 1.

Additionally, claim 1 recites the feature that the transmissive light modulation section is provided above the pixel drive circuit. The Examiner contends that the pixel drive circuit is met by circuits 157 of Fig. 22 of Colgan and that Figs. 27, 28, and 31 of Colgan show the transmissive section above the pixel drive circuit. However, the circuits 157 in the embodiment shown in Fig. 22 are placed aside of the deformable mirror 218 (which allegedly corresponds to the claimed transmissive light modulation section), as shown in Fig. 21 (switches 100 aside of deformable mirror 133). Moreover, in the alternative embodiment shown in Figs. 23-31, gate

lines 209, storage capacitor 207 and data lines 214 which control the pixel are also placed alongside of the deformable mirror 218. Thus, Colgan does not teach that the transmissive light modulation section is provided above the pixel drive circuit, as required by claim 1.

Claim 1 is therefore patentable over Colgan for at least these reasons.

Independent claims 3, 5, and 7 each recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claims 3, 5, and 7 are patentable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to the patentability of claim 1. The remaining claims are patentable based on their dependencies. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Claims 1 and 5 also stand rejected also under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Huibers (USPN 6,172,797).

Claim 1 recites the feature that the light modulation section be “transmissive”. The Examiner contends that the transmissive light modulation section of the present invention is met by the mirror 48 of Huibers. (See Fig. 3A and 3B, col. 9, line 60 - col. 10, line 35). However, as is clearly shown in Figs. 3A and 3B, incoming light beam 56 is reflected by mirror 48 and returned as outgoing light beam 58. Thus, Huibers does not teach a transmissive light modulation section, as required by claim 1.

Moreover, claim 1 recites the feature that the pixel drive circuit is provided on the transparent substrate to form an area other than the light-transmission area. The Examiner contends that this limitation is met by virtue of addressing circuitry 36 being formed on substrate 34 in an area partially occupying the transmissive area of the circuit substrate 34. However, as

noted in the previous paragraph, Huibers does not show an area where light is transmitted through the substrate. Therefore, it is impossible for the circuitry 36, which allegedly corresponds to the claimed pixel drive circuit, to be formed in an area “other than the light-transmission area”, as required by claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Huibers for at least these two reasons.

Claim 5 recites the feature of a transmissive light modulation section. As discussed above, Huibers does not show a transmissive light modulation section. Therefore, claim 5 is patentable over Huibers for at least this reason, and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Claim rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Colgan in view of Johnson (USPN 6,498,685).

Claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 each depend from independent claims 1, 3, 5, and 7, respectively, which have been shown above to be patentable over Colgan. Johnson does not cure the deficiencies of Colgan because Johnson relates generally to extreme ultraviolet (EUV) microlithography and to lithographic patterning of microstructures, and contains no teachings relevant to transmissive light modulation sections or pixel drive circuits. Therefore, claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 are patentable over the Colgan and Johnson combination for at least the reasons discussed above, and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

New Claim


Applicant herewith adds new claim 15 in order to more fully claim aspects of the invention.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin C. Kunzendorf
Registration No. 58,308

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 12, 2006